



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

#10/ Argument  
6-21-02  
DJ

In re Patent Application of: )  
THOMSON ET AL. )  
Serial No. 09/658,509 ) Art Unit: 3375  
Filing Date: SEPTEMBER 8, 2000 ) Examiner: C. KIM  
For: BICYCLE STEM FOR ENLARGED ) Attorney Docket No. 57012  
HANDLEBAR PORTIONS AND )  
ASSOCIATED METHODS )

AMENDMENT

Director, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED  
JUN 19 2002  
GROUP 360

Sir:

Responsive to the Office Action of May 2, 2002, please  
enter the remarks set out below.

REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough  
examination of the present application. The Examiner has  
objected to Claims 2-10, 12-19, and 21-27 because of the  
capitalization of "Claim". Applicants disagree with the Examiner  
and submit that it is not necessary to change "Claim" to "claim".  
"Claim" is merely being used as a proper noun.

The arguments supporting patentability of the present  
invention are found below.

I. The Double Patenting Rejection Is Improper

The Examiner also issued a non-statutory double  
patenting rejection of Claims 1-27. More particularly, the  
Examiner notes that the claims are unpatentable over Claims 1, 3,  
15, 24, 27, 31, 33, 35, 38, 40, 43, and 45 of copending  
- 11 - 09/658,509 in view of the Boddy patent